REMARKS

Claims 23-42 are all the claims pending in the present application. In summary, the Examiner maintains the same previous prior art rejections. Specifically, claims 23-25, 27-28, 31-34, 36-37 and 40-42 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kitamura (Domain Name Auto-Registration for Plugged-in IPv6 Nodes, http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-dnsext-ipv6-name-auto-reg-00.txt, dated 12/02/2002) in view of Borella (US 2003/0229697). Claims 26 and 35 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Borella and further in view of Thomson et al (IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration, http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2462.txt, dated December 1998, hereafter Thomson). Claims 29-30 and 38-39 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Borella and further in view of Narten et al (Neighbor Discovery for IP Version 6 (IPv6), RFC 2461, http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2461.txt, dated 12/1998, hereafter Narten).

§103(a) Rejections (Kitamura/Borella) - Claims 23-25, 27, 28, 31-34, 36, 37 and 40-42

Claims 23-25, 27, 28, 31-34, 36, 37 and 40-42 are rejected essentially based on the same reasons set forth in the previous Office Action, except the Examiner adds new arguments in the *Response to Arguments* section of the present Office Action.

With respect to independent claim 23, Applicant previously argued that the applied references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest at least, "wherein the first message is a neighbor solicitation (NS) message requiring a duplicate address detection (DAD)," as recited in claim 23. *See pages 8-9 of Amendment dated July 11, 2007 and pages 2-4 of Response dated January 22, 2008.*

In the *Response to Arguments* section of the present Office Action, the Examiner alleges:

> Applicant's main argument is that a DNS update message and a DAD NS message (Neighbor Solicitation requiring duplicate address detection) are different. Applicant adds that the destination of DAD NS message of Kitamura is not a DNS server. However, consider the simplest example of a single-link topology (Kitamura , Fig. 1), it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art that both the detector and registrar can be placed inside the DNS server (page 6, par. 1, detector can be installed anywhere on IPv6 nodes, page 9 par. 4, a registrar can be placed anywhere). In Fig. 3, DAD NS messages f and I containing IP address and domain name of a host starting from a host and ending at a DNS server. Kitamura's 2 messages are separate. However, Borella discloses a single message containing both IP address and domain name to a DNS server to register both IP address and domain name. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Kitamura with the teachings of Borella in order to implement a message that contains both IP address and domain name of a host, hence to register both domain name and IP address of a host at the same time to reduce network traffic accessing the DNS server unnecessarily.

In response, Applicant submits that even if, *arguendo*, a detector can be placed inside a DNS server, said detector of Fig. 1 of Kitamura is a detector which detects appearances of new plugged in IPv6 nodes. *See section 3.1 of Kitamura.* However, there is no teaching or suggestion of a neighbor solicitation (NS) message requiring a duplicate address detection (DAD). That is, nowhere does Kitamura teach detecting whether an address is a duplicate; Kitamura only teaches the detection of new plugged in nodes.

Further, the Examiner alleges that Borella discloses a single message containing both an IP address and domain name of a host. In response, Applicant submits that this assertion, even if accurate, clearly does not satisfy the feature of a neighbor solicitation (NS) message requiring a duplicate address detection (DAD).

At least based on the foregoing as well as the previously submitted arguments, Applicant maintains that claim 23 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references.

Applicant maintains that claim 33 is patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 23.

Applicant submits that claims 24, 25, 27, 28, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37 and 40-42 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependency from independent claims 23 and 33.

§103(a) Rejections (Kitamura/Borella/Narten) - Claims 29, 30, 38 and 39

With respect to claims 29 and 38, Applicant submits that these claims are patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 23.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 30 and 39 are patentable by virtue of their respective dependencies from claims 29 and 38.

§103(a) Rejections (Kitamura/Borella/Thomson) - Claims 26 and 35

With respect to claim independent claims 26 and 35, Applicant maintains that these claims are patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 23. Thomson does not make up for the deficiencies of the other applied references.

Further Arguments

Further, the Examiner alleges that "it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art that both the detector and registrar can be placed inside the DNS server" (see "Response to Arguments" of this Office Action).

The pages 5-6 and figures 1-2 of Kitamura disclose the following.

```
3. To make the mechanism flexible and enable it to be applied
   to various environments (office networks, home networks, etc.)

   If the mechanism is applied to home networks, Registrars can be
   placed at the Provider side, and Detectors can be placed at the
   User side.


Figure 1 and 2 show typical examples that indicate locations where
Detector and Registrar functions are placed on the IPv6 network.

Figure 1 shows a case for a single link, and Figure 2 shows a case
for multiple links.
```

```
       |                                    +------------+
       |                                    | DNS Server |
     +-+-+  %%%%%%%%%%%%  #############     +------+-----+
     | R |  % Detector %  # Registrar #           /
     +-+-+  %%%%%%%%%%%%  #############         +----+
       |          |             |                   /
   ----+----------+--------+----+---------------+-----
                           |
                    +============+
                    | Plugged-in |
                    | IPv6 Node  |
                    +============+
```

Fig. 1 Single-Link Case Example

```
                                  | DNS Server |
           #############          +------+-----+
           # Registrar #                /
           #############              +----+
                 |                        /
   ----+---------+-----------+--------+------
       |                     |
     +-+-+  %%%%%%%%%%%%%   +-+-+  %%%%%%%%%%%%%
     | R1|  % Detector1 %   | R2|  % Detector2 %
     +-+-+  %%%%%%%%%%%%%   +-+-+  %%%%%%%%%%%%%
       |          |           |          |
   ----+-----+----+-----  ----+-----+----+-----
             |                      |
      +============+         +============+
      | Plugged-in |         | Plugged-in |
      | IPv6 Node  |         | IPv6 Node  |
      +============+         +============+
```

Fig. 2 Multiple-Link Case Example

Figure 1 shows one example where a Detector and Registrar are placed on a single link. Figure 2 shows another example where a Detector and Registrar are placed on multiple links. Essentially, Figure 1 shows the locations where the Detector and Registrar are placed separately on a single link. Therefore, Applicant does **not** agree with the Examiner's allegation that both the detector and registrar can be placed inside the DNS server.

Furthermore, Kitamura discloses "Registrar can be placed at the Provider side, and Detectors can be placed at the User side" (see page 5 of Kitamura). Applicant submits that the DNS server cannot be at the User side in the context of Client (User) vs Server. Therefore, Applicant does **not** agree with the Examiner's allegation that both the detector and registrar can be placed inside the DNS server.

Thus, since the premise upon which the Examiner bases the claim rejections is not supportable, Applicant submits that the claimed invention is patentably distinguishable over the applied references.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 19, 2008